

SERVICE DELIVERY REFORM COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Burbank Airport Hilton

Burbank, CA

September 14, 1999

MAJOR ISSUES DISCUSSED:

- Following introductions, members were told that by April 1, 2000, the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) is required to present a framework or conceptual plan for reform of our service delivery system to the Legislature. The service reform framework will need to embrace a performance-based consumer outcome system that also addresses quality of service issues at the local level.
- A presentation by Denyse Curtright of DDS' Services and Supports Section summarized the work of Mark Friedman's Results Accountability Model. Mark Friedman, Director of the Fiscal Policy Studies Institute, developed the model to help agencies develop and measure progress toward identified results. The Results Accountability Model is a practical, easy-to-understand concept that describes how to determine what types of accountability are appropriate and useful. The model supports collaborative planning and diverse strategies while building a common language for tracking results at both the local and statewide levels. The presentation reviewed how the model seeks to establish a common understanding of the results accountability concepts (e.g., Results/Outcome, Indicators/Benchmarks, and Performance Measures). Handouts with samples of diagrams and forms were provided so that committee members could visualize the development of a model framework and how the model can be used for accountability at the local level, as well as the state level.
- The presentation included an illustration of how the Committee's personal outcomes draft could be used to develop Results Accountability Model outcomes and indicators. The Committee was encouraged to consider the model as a tool that would be used by all of the workgroups to develop service specific outcomes.
- Discussion continued on the importance of having a common framework to approach the development of outcomes, indicators, and performance measures within the workgroups. Although each of the workgroups (Adult Day Services, Supported Living, Residential, Respite, and Infant) may be different, the need for a common "house frame" to build the set of regulations on, is critical. The group was also reminded that the reform process would also include a new rate methodology with a corresponding set of new regulations.
- During the discussion period, committee members were concerned that development of a new service delivery framework using a committee process is a lengthy process and unlikely to meet the timeline for the April 2000 report. Concerns were expressed that the lengthy process would exacerbate current

funding difficulties. A summary of the recent funding enactments by the Legislature was presented as an example of the commitment the Legislature has already made to the reform effort by putting more funds into the service delivery system.

- The consensus of the Committee was that DDS' staff should continue working on this framework model as long as it is not used in a rigid manner, and as long as the agreed upon outcomes that were developed earlier are not lost in the process. Any further review of the document and consequent changes that take place will be presented to the Committee at future meetings.
- One member suggested that the word "adult" be added in the terminology under the "Family Unity" section of the Personal Outcomes and Indicators draft. The Committee agreed to address this issue.

Discussion of Rates and Rate Models:

- DDS announced that staff are in the process of finalizing a Request for Proposal (RFP) to contract out development of a cost model for use in setting rates paid for residential services. In addition, the Committee was informed that the RFP would include a second phase in which the same contractor would explore development of a cost model for adult day services, infant development programs, respite services, and supported living services by applying the same rate methodology to all of the service categories in order to simplify the rate setting system, as some other states have done. Common components of the system would be defined as part of this review and would likely include direct service worker costs, fixed costs, and clinical type professional services. Pros and cons of having a common rate model were discussed. It was stressed that it would consist of a common methodology—not a common rate. The timeline for selecting a contractor is projected for January 2000. The consensus of the committee members was to support this proposal in its goal to achieve a more simplified approach, as long as the input of the Committee is not circumvented.
- After lunch, workgroup reports were made to the Committee in the following order:
 - Residential Workgroup Shelton Dent
 - Supported Living Workgroup Julia Mullen
 - Adult Day Services Workgroup Julie Jackson
 - Evaluation Workgroup John Moise

[Note: Written copies of the workgroup reports presented were contained in the meeting packet mailed to committee members prior to the meeting.]

- Recommendations of these workgroups were taken under submission and will be further discussed at the next meeting. In the interest of time, the Infant Workgroup and Respite Workgroup will report on their recommendations at the next meeting.
- Following the Adult Day Services Workgroup report, concerns were raised on the report's recommendation that adult day service programs be accredited. Some of the concerns raised were:
 - The cost may be prohibitive.
 - Is it practical to require accreditation for individuals (e.g., "parent" type vendors)?
 - The system should not be a pass/fail system, but should be a way to improve the quality of services.
 - If it is good for adult day services, it should be good for all the service providers.
 - The importance of accreditation is having standards and various tools to judge service successes.
 - Any accreditation system should contain elements that are unique to California and be flexible to allow for changes that move the system forward.
 - There is a need to have a longer discussion on accreditation for those who do not fully understand how the various accreditation agencies work.
- The Committee decided to allow the accreditation discussions to continue within each workgroup and to have the Evaluation Committee, with representatives from each subcommittee, do further analysis. Adult Day Services Workgroup members, familiar with CARF accreditation, offered to meet with other workgroups to answer questions on how the process works. A discussion of this issue will be on the agenda for the next meeting.
- Consumer representatives from Southern California requested that they be given a choice to attend the meetings in Northern California. This request was approved.
- The Committee agreed to the following meeting schedule:
 - Sacramento: Tuesday, November 16, 1999
 - Burbank: Tuesday, January 18, 2000
 - Sacramento: Tuesday, March 21, 2000